

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1-4, 7 and 10-20 are amended, and new claims 21-30 are added. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity, and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,629,134 to Hayward and U.S. Patent 6,505,243 to Lortz. The Office Action also rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward and Lortz and IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin "Real-Time Error Mapping of a Memory Basic Storage Module or System with No Performance Degradation to the System," (hereafter IBM Bulletin). Still further, the Office Action rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward and Lortz and JP 06008594 to Kaneko. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the product received from the Internet based on the proper information of the product and the contact information.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1. In particular, Hayward describes that a peripheral condition may be determined and sent by firmware 16 over bus 32 to a computer 30. See Hayward's Fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 10-18. Hayward also discloses the display of menu choices such as a fourth menu entry to access a digital user manual having hyperlinked information and help files. See col. 5, lines 52-57. Hayward further describes launching a browser to access a manufacturer's server to provide

additional information about a peripheral condition. This additional information may be text, audio clips or video clips. See col. 6, lines 21-57.

Hayward does not teach or suggest displaying an error checkup menu of a product received from the Internet based on the product information. In particular, Hayward merely discloses information may be provided from a manufacturer's server. While Hayward discloses a user manual having hyperlinked information and help files, there is no suggestion for an error check-up menu received from the Internet based on the proper information of the product. At best, Hayward merely describes that text, audio clips and video clips may be received for a server. Accordingly, Hayward does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Lortz does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 missing from Hayward. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 10 recites receiving service menu information corresponding to the product, selecting information from the received service menu information, receiving the selected information from the service menu information, and displaying the selected information on a screen. The applied references do not teach or suggest these features.

Hayward does not teach or suggest receiving service menu information, selecting information from the received service menu information and receiving the selected information. Rather, Hayward merely describes information (i.e., text, audio or video) may be provided for a product based on information transmitted to the manufacturer's server. There is no suggestion for the receipt of service menu information, selection of information from a received service

menu information and/or the receiving of the selected information. Hayward merely describes that information is received about a product. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the missing features. Accordingly, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

Furthermore, independent claim 27 recites a controlling unit to transmit the stored information and error information of the product to an Internet site. Independent claim 26 further recites the controlling unit to receive error information based on the transmitted error information, and the controlling unit to automatically apply the received error information so as to restore the error. For at least similar reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 27. Further, the applied references do not suggest automatically applying the received error information so as to restore the error. Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10 and 26 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-9 and 24-26 depend from claim 1, claims 21-23 depend from claim 10 and claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and therefore define patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims also recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 2 recites the controlling unit automatically restores an error of the product based on received information. Dependent claim 26 further recites that the received information is based on selection of an item in the error checkup menu. Hayward does not teach or suggest that a controlling unit automatically restores an error of the product based

on the received information. The Office Action references Hayward's col. 5, lines 10-19, lines 65-67 and col. 6, lines 1-4 for these features. The Office Action further states that this is suggested by the error being restored when the user is shown how to replace an ink cartridge. However, this is not restoring an error automatically as previously recited. Furthermore, Hayward does not teach or suggest the features of automatically restoring an error of the product based on the received information. Hayward also does not suggest that the received information is based on selection of an item in the error checkup. Accordingly, dependent claims 2 and 3 define patentable subject matter for at least for these additional reasons.

Dependent claim 11 recites restoring an error item based on the received selected information. Dependent claim 25 recites the controlling unit receives measures to automatically restore the error, and the controlling unit automatically restores the error based on the received measures. Further, dependent claim 23 recites the TV automatically restoring the error based on the received measures. As set forth above, Hayward and the other applied references do not teach or suggest automatically restoring errors based on received information. Accordingly, each of these dependent claims 11, 23 and 25 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Additionally, dependent claim 15 recites receiving a list of errors after judging whether an error occurs in the product when the selected information is error checkup menu information, and receiving measures about the error in order to restore the error automatically when information for restoring the error exists in the list of errors. The Office Action appears to rely on Hayward as describing information communicated between a peripheral component and a

Reply to Office Action dated April 19, 2005

computer 30. This does not teach or suggest the features regarding receiving a list of errors and receiving measures about the error as recited in dependent claim 15. Thus, dependent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of claims 1-30 defines patentable subject matter. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/842,082  
Reply to Office Action dated April 19, 2005

Docket No. P-0222

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-30 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/knv/kah:tlg

**Date: June 13, 2005**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**